

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are now amended. The claim amendments are fully supported the application as filed and do not introduce new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicants' representatives Bryant Wade and Brent Seitz thank Primary Examiner Schechter and Examiner Qi for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews of January 13th and 17th. During the interviews, Applicants explained the differences between the claims and the cited art. Examiner Schechter agreed that the claims were not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited art. However, Examiner Schechter cited two additional references that he believed were relevant and could potentially be used to reject Applicants' claims. Specifically, Examiner Schechter cited U.S. Pat. Nos. 6,956,632 (Ozawa et al.) and 6,850,298 (Fujimori et al.). Applicants address these references herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,632,514) in view of Ogura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,271,902) and in view of Narutaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,906,765). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As set forth above, Examiner Schechter indicated during the telephonic interviews that this Section 103 rejection has been overcome and is now moot. Therefore, a detailed response to this rejection is not necessary.

NEW ART CITED DURING TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

During the telephonic interview, Examiner Schechter indicated that the claims could potentially be rejected under Section 102 in light of Ozawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,956,632) or Fujimori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,850,298). Any such rejection based on these references is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is now amended to recite, in part and with reference to Figure 3 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, a first colored layer 214C disposed in a first region Ls of the substrate. A second colored layer 214F disposed in a second region Hs of the substrate. The surface of the second region where the second colored layer is disposed is higher than a surface of the first region where the first colored layer is disposed. A step difference plane 215s is provided between the first region and the second region. An interface portion 214X between the first colored layer and the second colored layer is disposed in a region closer toward the second region than is the bottom portion of the step difference plane. The first colored layer and the second colored layer overlap each other at the interface portion.

Amended Claims 7 and 13 recite, in part and with reference to Figure 3 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, a first

colored layer 214C and a second colored layer 214F overlapping each other at the interface portion 214X.

The Ozawa et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 21B, a first colored filter 82 and a second colored filter 81. The Ozawa et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest that the first colored filter overlaps the second colored filter. Therefore, the Ozawa et al. reference fails to anticipate or render obvious the feature of the first colored layer and the second colored layer overlapping each other at the interface portion as set forth in amended Claims 1, 7, and 13.

The Fujimori et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 7, a first colored filter 42a and a second colored filter 42b. The Fujimori et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest that the first and second colored filters overlap. Therefore, the Fujimori et al. reference fails to anticipate or render obvious the feature of the first colored layer and the second colored layer overlapping each other at the interface portion as set forth in Claims 1, 7, and 13.

As set forth above, any rejection of the amended claims based on the Ozawa et al. reference and/or the Fujimori et al. reference fails to anticipate or render the amended claims obvious.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

Jan 27, 2006

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BGS/les